Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
for CDRU # 171 Case File # 95-268800.

Material Examiners Malone (RO)

Remarks:

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: _STEVE ROBERTSON_

Area(s) of Expertise: _HAIR AND FIBERS_

Review commenced at: _9:30A_ (Time), _5/19/99_ (Date)

File #: _95-268800_

Laboratory #(s): _50910017_ _____

_50919024_ _____

_51003033_ _____

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
_VM_	☐	☒	_QS_	☐	☒
_RU_	☐	☒	_WX_	☐	☒
_RQ_	☒	☐	_RF_	☐	☒

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: _MICHAEL MALONE_

Testimony Date(s): _3-13-86_ Pages: _550-577_

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: _50919024_ Date: _11-14-85_

Laboratory Number: _50910017_ Date: _____

Laboratory Number: _51003033_ Date: _____

Examiner Bench Notes of: _RQ AND UNKNOWN TECHNICIAN_

Laboratory Number: _50919024_

Laboratory Number: _50910017_

Laboratory Number: _____

Page _1_ of _4_

Initials: _SUL_

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes   ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: _WORK SHEET #50919024 , LETTER_

FROM SUBMITTING AGENCY DATED 9-6-85

Results of Review

File #: _95-268800_   Item or Specimen # Reviewed: _Q3-Q5, Q7-Q11,_

_K3_

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

> Note: Numbered comments are required below or on
> additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1)   Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
                                             ☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☒ Unable to Determine

2)   Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?   ☐ Yes   ☒ No   ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

> Note: Numbered comments are required below or on
> additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

☐ Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)?   ☒ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes?   ☐ Yes   ☒ No   ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise?   ☒ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Unable to Determine

Page _2_ of _4_

Initials _ERL_

Comments
(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

#1. THERE IS INSUFFICIENT DOCUMENTATION TO DETERMINE IF THE FIBER COMPARISON WAS DONE IN A SCIENTIFICALLY ACCEPTABLE MANNER.

#2. DOCUMENTATION OF THE EXAMINATION RESULTS ARE NOT ADEQUATE. NOTES ARE NOT DATED. THE EXAMINER USES ABBREVIATIONS THAT CANNOT BE INTERPRETED BY THIS REVIEWER. THE TESTS PERFORMED ARE NOT DOCUMENTED. SPECTRAL CHARTS ARE NOT DATED OR LABELLED.

THE REPORT SAYS BROWN CAUCASIAN HAIR WERE RECOVERED FROM Q7 - Q11. THE TECHNICIAN'S NOTES DO NOT MENTION THE PRESENCE OR RECOVERY OF ANY HAIR ON THESE ITEMS (EXCEPT FOR Q8) AND THE EXAMINER'S NOTES CONTAIN ABSOLUTELY

Review completed at: 12:30P (Time), 5/19/99 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 3 HOURS

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of ___4___ pages.

Steve Roberts (Signature)   5-19-99 (Date)

Additional Comments
(Set forth by question #, if applicable)

File #: __95-268800__

NO REFERENCE TO HAIR BEING PRESENT OR EXAMINED.

#4. EXAMINOR TESTIFIED THAT "Q8 HAD A GREEN CARPET FIBER" (p 569 #22). IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO IDENTIFY A MODACRYLIC FIBER WITH A DOG BONE CROSS-SECTION, SUCH AS Q8, AS A CARPET FIBER, BASED UPON THESE CHARACTERISTICS. IT APPEARS THE EXAMINOR CONCLUDES THE Q8 FIBER IS A CARPET FIBER ONLY BECAUSE HE DEEMS IT A MATCH TO THE K3 CARPET.

THERE IS A CONCERN THAT THE FIBER RECOVERED FROM Q8 MAY BE A RESULT OF A SECONDARY TRANSFER NOT RELATED TO THE CRIME.

Page __4__ of __4__

Initials: __Sur__